



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

warship clause of the Treaty has been described as a "self-denying ordinance." The description is correct if it is well to encourage the fighting spirit by a preparedness for fighting, which necessarily acts as a temptation to fight. On the other hand, the description is incorrect and the warship clause spells not sacrifice, but an enlightened view of self interest if peace is the true national policy and is promoted by any expedient that delays and obstructs hostile outbreaks and gives time for passions to cool and reason to reassert itself.

**President Abbott Lawrence Lowell, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.**

Your plan for a commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States after the War of 1812 seems to me an excellent one, and I am not at all sure that the actual anniversary of the treaty, that is, December, 1914, would be a bad time for it. However, that is an unimportant matter.

The century of peace along our great frontier of three thousand miles long is certainly a very notable event in the world's history, and there has never, perhaps, been a time within that century when the prospects of an indefinite continuance of that peace have been brighter than they are at the present day.

The provision in the treaty forbidding the maintenance of naval fleets upon the Great Lakes is in itself a matter that deserves commemoration. How many people would have expected at the time that the provision would be scrupulously observed for a century!

I think you are quite right also, as a matter of sentiment and policy, in excluding all military forms of demonstration from the occasion. One of the things that might be commemorated would be the growth and mutual assistance of our educational institutions within that period, and in this the universities of the United States and Canada could help.

**Cardinal Gibbons.**

I take great pleasure in concurring with the views of the distinguished gentlemen in recommending the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the treaty of peace which was signed between Great Britain and the United States in 1814. This celebration will not only record a memorable pacific event, but it will serve to ratify and consolidate a lasting peace between these two great nations.

And I am persuaded that England and America, by maintaining peace among themselves, will, at the same time, be the guardians and sentinels of peace and goodwill among the nations of the earth. Such now, thank God, is the influence and prestige of these two English-speaking nations that few powers will venture to plunge into the Sea of Strife so long as our country and England shall say to them, "Peace be still," and "Thus far you shall come, and you shall go no further, and here you shall break your swelling waves"—of discord.

**His Excellency Eben S. Draper, Governor of Massachusetts.**

I do approve most heartily of a British-American celebration of the one hundred years of peace that have existed between our two great nations.

While it is important for us to maintain friendly relations with all nations, it is especially a cause for congratulation that our relations with our great neighbor, Canada, which forms our northern boundary, should not merely be peaceful, but extremely friendly.

I am anxious that our relations shall not only be peaceful and friendly, but grow more intimate as time goes on, and I believe that a celebration such as you refer to will help in that direction.

**His Excellency A. Pothier, Governor of Rhode Island.**

The idea of the proposed American-Canadian peace celebration in 1914 appeals to me as being in the line of establishing more intimate relations between the United States and the provinces of Great Britain which bound the northern line of this country. The historical significance of the celebration is certainly noteworthy, but the opportunities for a closer intimacy and a better understanding between the citizens of the two countries whose commercial interests are so largely identical will, I believe, be widely recognized and taken advantage of by the progressive people of both.

**Hon. Richard Bartholdt, M. C., President of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union.**

There is in all history no lesson as instructive as is the agreement between the United States and Great Britain with respect to Canada. The two great countries, ninety-six years ago, agreed by treaty to withdraw the soldiers from the boundary line between Canada and the United States, to dismantle the forts and police the lakes by means of a few gunboats on each side armed by one small gun and twenty men each. This treaty has been the means of permanent peace between Canada and the United States, and to arrange on the eve of the third Hague Conference an impressive celebration of this historical event is a splendid idea, because it will carry the lesson that the peace between all of the other nations could be safeguarded in exactly the same manner. I trust the centennial will be celebrated in a way worthy of its significance, and may serve as an example in the future so that peaceful achievements may be commemorated in preference to the triumphs of bloody war.

**Dean Henry Wade Rogers, Yale University Law School.**

I most heartily approve the proposal to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Ghent in 1914 and the century of peace which has existed between this country and Great Britain. The experience of a hundred years has justified the wisdom of that great treaty, and the celebration proposed will not only cement the friendship which exists between the United States and England, but it should also be used to advance the cause of peace between the nations of the world. The present policy of this and other nations of constructing great Dreadnaughts and wasting annually on immense armaments millions of money will lead some nations into national bankruptcy if not soon brought to an end.

**Rev. Francis E. Clark, D. D., LL. D., President United Society of Christian Endeavor, Boston.**

As one who was born on the Canadian side of the imaginary line which divides the two great nations of North America, and yet is a descendant of eight generations of Massachusetts ancestors, I rejoice to express my sympathy with the movement to celebrate the centenary of peace between Great Britain and the United States.

The fact that two great nations can live side by side for one hundred years without any forts or naval armaments to keep the peace is a lesson which ought to be impressed upon the whole world; and this celebration will do much to make this impression.

I am sure I can speak for the three and a half millions of Christian Endeavorers in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, who belong to an organization that stands preeminently for peace, fellowship and goodwill, when I say that, without exception, they, too, will rejoice in the celebration of one hundred years of peace.

**Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.**

The simple fact that the United States and Great Britain have sustained peace for one hundred years is of great significance and well worthy of recognition. For this has been accomplished through self-restraint and sense of justice on both sides.

A proper observance of the fact will start the two great nations off for another century more closely bound together than ever before.

## Humane Teaching and International Peace.

BY CARL HEATH, SECRETARY OF THE BRITISH NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL.

*Address at the Sixth British National Peace Congress, 1910.*  
EDUCATION RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CONGRESS.

"Whereas, the aim of national education should be to create intelligent, generous and independent citizens, and whereas the aim of the militarist party in seeking to capture the public secondary school, and to link young boys to the

army organization by means of cadet corps and rifle shooting contests at Bisley is to turn the youth of the land into supporters of the militarist view of life ;

"This Congress calls upon liberal-minded headmasters actively to oppose the method of this new militarism in the interests of a liberal and humanizing education.

"Further, the Congress urges upon all elementary school teachers, and upon the authorities controlling the public elementary schools, the supreme need of developing in young children the ethical sense of justice, of teaching them that there is but one moral code for nations and for individuals, and of setting before them the ideals of a higher humanity aiming at life-saving and human brotherhood rather than of power obtained by war and brute force."

Mr. Carl Heath, secretary of the National Peace Council, said: In moving this resolution I desire to emphasize one or two of the expressions in its wording. One of these is the "militarist view of life." As a former schoolmaster, I particularly wish to do no injustice to those colleagues of mine in the school-mastering profession who hold this view. What is it in militarism that appeals to so many men, or shall I say schoolmasters, not of brutal and aggressive instincts, but of culture, of religious feelings and often of large nature? For, of course, it is not to be pretended that all our opponents in this matter are either stupid or savage. The support which many headmasters give to militarism is often, it must be admitted, due to a largeness of temperament, a desire to develop strength from struggle, to teach service of the state in place of satisfaction of self. And it is this ideal life behind the military form that makes the growth of militarism in the schools so much the more profoundly dangerous.

The other day I read again those lines of the poet, W. E. Henley:—

Out of the night that covers me,  
Black as the pit from pole to pole,  
I thank whatever gods may be  
For my unconquerable soul.

In the fell clutch of circumstance  
I have not winced nor cried aloud.  
Under the bludgeonings of chance  
My head is bloody, but unbowed.

Beyond this place of wrath and tears  
Looms but the horror of the shade,  
And yet the menace of the years  
Finds and shall find me unafraid.

It matters not how strait the gate,  
How charged with punishments the scroll,  
I am the master of my fate ;  
I am the captain of my soul.

Here is finely expressed the kind of idealism I am thinking of. For Henley was just one of those men who was an ardent militarist, imperialist and supporter of all those things we are opposed to. Yet no one could know Henley without recognizing the fineness of his nature, the disinterestedness and largeness of his life.

Behind the soldier view of existence, in fact, is a powerful and effective sort of ideal that appeals to many schoolmasters, and must be recognized and understood before we can successfully grapple with the problem of the invasion of the schools by militarism.

Now I have lived in the schools for the last twenty years, and I feel quite sure that whilst it may be our duty, and, indeed, the only course, to meet with a direct negative the demand for public support of cadet corps

and rifle ranges in the schools, that is *not* the best way to meet the spirit which animates many of the best of our schoolmasters in demanding these things. Still less is it effective to describe this spirit as an optical illusion, and to demonstrate that the military organization of national life will not lead to commercial advantage—will not, in a successful war, as Mr. Norman Angell tells us, "Make a single Englishman a shilling's worth the richer." I am not disparaging Mr. Angell's book, which is one every pacifist should read, but I can imagine the contempt of a Henley, or, let us say, an ordinary public schoolmaster, for such an argument.

School life, if it is worth anything, is essentially a period of constructive formation, and pacifists would therefore do well to put forward their aims in the educational *milieu* on an essentially constructive basis. That is why, both as a humanitarian and as a teacher, I hope to see more time and thought given to the working out of a constructive humanitarianism which shall show teachers, in what I may call a historical atmosphere, the growth of humane development, how the spirit of service and struggle is raised from age to age to higher levels, how those ideals of life which prompt the acceptance of militarism can be made to subserve a higher human development and a higher human service.

In the schools we want a constructive atmosphere of humane thought, an environment of humanity as well as of humanities. It was with this idea in view that the National Peace Council this year sent literature to the head teachers of each of the twenty-one thousand elementary schools in England and Wales—a propaganda which has had considerable success.

Letters received from schoolmasters show that there is a large field for work through the teachers. Next we will attack the secondary schools, and perhaps that may prove even more valuable work, because under the newer developments of the educational ladder these schools are beginning to contain the pick of the children of all classes. At any rate we want to bring the peace movement and all that it stands for into *all* types of schools. I particularly feel that we need to influence the history teaching and the teaching of civic and national morals. And again our work must be through the teachers.

One of the greatest difficulties we have to contend with is the belief that peace people are a flabby type, a somewhat namby-pamby, goody-goody kind, who desire above all things a pleasant, undisturbed world of material comfort. Well, what I say to boys when I have the chance of speaking to them on this question is this: International peace does not mean the end of struggle and striving, a resting the oars as we float on a sea of prosperous, undisturbed good living. On the contrary, it means bucking up, a higher and deeper and much more difficult struggle. We are not barbarians, we are civilized; but we have got to get on beyond civilization.

Civilization has developed the social order—civilized man, but not yet humanized him. That is the next stage we are getting on to. In humanization we are going to bid final farewell not only to the brute-individual (barbarism), but to the brute-society (present civilization), but never to struggling and striving—to the effort to develop to our utmost all our capacities of mind and heart, to bear unflinchingly the bludgeonings of life and to remain captains of our souls.

Let us teach the young at least that the struggle of the future is to arise not through lust of food, as with savages; not through lust of power and dominance, as with civilized men; but through desire for social service, scientific knowledge and spiritual progression, for these are the qualities of the humanized man.

To those who are not teachers I would say, do not mistake the ordinary boy. I know him well. I have had him for daily companion in a dozen different parts of the country, in a dozen different types of school—private, slum and public school. He may not have arrived at that stage when we are told that every boy will be at least a Bernard Shaw in intellectual gymnastics, and he may be a young barbarian in some ways still, but at least he has a keen sense of the virtue of personal justice and of personal honor.

It lies with adults to apply that sense to the life of the world and to show children that what is wrong for me as a man cannot be right for me as a citizen. If lying, thieving, murder are crimes for me, so they are for my country. And any child can see it. It takes the confused mind of an adult to fail to grasp the unity of moral truth and action and to create for himself a double standard.

And then racial hatreds (which are the roots of war) no genuine children have. In English public school life I have known Spaniard, French, Russian, Jap, Hindoo and negro boys, and I have been myself a foreign boy in a foreign school. The only racial difficulty for children is the language difficulty. There is no other.

The others come by the things and the thoughts we surround children with. The introduction of militarism into the schools is the introduction of an atmosphere of enmity, of suspicion, of thoughts of power obtained by force. It is always morally retrograde for the young. We pacifists, desiring as we do a finer, juster, more rational form of human society, must, of course, use all our opportunities for promoting the evolution of this society, but chiefly we must ever remember that this humaner society, which will not come in a day, lies in the hands of the children and of the children's children to bring about. *They* must establish the *Vita Nuova*. Our appeal is to all men and women of goodwill who desire that era which Lord Courtney has so finely described as one "in which a series of moral forces will take the place of the series of physical forces" making up the history of the past. But most of all in this wonderful evolution of man through the ages, from barbarism to civilization and from civilization to humanization, the eternal appeal which the moral conscience makes to humanity to live more resolutely as Goethe said, "In the Whole, the Good and the Beautiful," must always be, in the main, an appeal to the young.

### Baron Ii Kamon, the Man Who Prevented War Between the United States and Japan in 1852.

BY J. H. DEFOREST, D.D., SENDAI, JAPAN.

In the United States National Museum, Washington, D. C., is a wooden statue of Baron Ii Kamon, which probably very few people notice, and even those who stop to look at it doubtless think it a rather repulsive

object unworthy of any special inquiry. I was talking recently with one of his retainers, a fine gentleman over seventy, and he said: "I was sorry to have that statue of our daimyo go to America, for its face is altogether too fierce; he wasn't that kind of a man."

However that may be, Baron Kamon was of necessity a man of powerful will, the one decisive character in those eventful days when Commodore Perry's fleet threw Japan into a kind of wild panic. "Drive the barbarians out!" was the irresponsible cry of the two-sworded samurai; and this panic-fever reached its height when the father of the present emperor virtually ordered the expulsion of the western barbarians, and had prayers offered at the Ise Shrine for the success of this attempt.

At that agitated time when the ablest statesmen were in doubt, or else had completely lost their heads, Ii Naosuke, lord of Hikone Castle and special guardian of the imperial court, was called to the premiership of the Shogunate, and received imperial instructions to drive out the barbarians. Here, then, was the greatest crisis of modern Japanese history, with the Kyoto court and many of the ablest daimyos and the hot blood of multitudes of samurai all against any intercourse with foreigners; with many other high officials in positive perplexity and unable to offer any solution of this unexpected national problem; and with only a few daring to favor the opening of the country, knowing that such advice exposed them to a traitor's death.

Then this clear-headed premier gave his views to his counsellors: "These barbarians will surely make war, just as they have done in China, unless we enter into treaty relations with them. We are absolutely unable to fight them with any prospect of victory. We shall surely be defeated and forced to make a humiliating treaty. The only way to save our country is to make the best treaty we can now, and then prepare for war on equal terms."

So, to save his country from unknown calamity, he ordered the signing of the first commercial treaty with the United States. This act cost him his life, but it saved us from war. He was warned that he would be assassinated if he dared to enter treaty relations with us, but he coolly replied that he knew the consequences. And sure enough the fatal deed was accomplished shortly after the signing, April 12, 1860.

The story of this great statesman is worthy of a place in the memory of Americans who take pride in the peaceful work of Commodore Perry and Townsend Harris, and who rejoice in the consequent half century of growing friendship between the two great nations that face each other across the Pacific. Just as in all the schools of Japan the names of Perry and Harris are well known, so the name of Ii Naosuke, whose brave self-sacrifice enabled our two nations to come together without war, should be familiar to the entire student body of the United States.

Tourists riding from Tokyo to Kyoto have a fine view from the car windows of the historic castle at Hikone, where the powerful Ii family ruled for generations, furnishing six of the nine premiers of the Tokugawa Shogunate during two hundred and sixty-four years. The castle commands a glorious view of the greatest lake in Japan, Lake Biwa. In this castle every year the Hikone samurai celebrate the birthday of their martyred lord, whom, next to the emperor, they reverence above